PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES
22 August, 1978

U.D.C. Master Plan

Norman Hoover
George Budd
Edward Holland
Marvin Shenkler

National Zoo, Central Area

Theodore Reed
Joseph Wilkes

National Zoo, Gibbon Island

Theodore Reed
Lester Collins
Ronald Taylor

Navy Fuel Oil Storage Tanks

Richard Scalessa

Susan B. Anthony Dollar

Francis Frere
Alan Goman
Raymond Myers

1218 31st Street, N.W.

Phillip Grace

3230 Reservoir Road, N.W.

Reid Dunn
Jack Brady

1050 Thomas Jefferson Street

Vlastimil Koubek

Hamilton Arms

Richard Stauffer
Joe Chang
Mark Brown

303 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E.

Martin Schwarz

Old Georgetown Board

Wynant D. Vanderpool
Anne Vytlacil
Thomas Wright

Citizens

Katharine Sullivan
Grosvenor Chapman
Donald Shannon

Alicia Boyd
Courts Oulahan

Deborah Day
Brooke Higdon
Phyllis Britt
Marisabel Vidaurre

U.S.S. Williamsburg

Chuck Clinton
Willem Polak

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
22 August, 1978

The meeting convened at 10:00 AM in the offices of the Commission of Fine Arts at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members Present:	*Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman* *Hon. Philip W. Buchen* *Hon. Eli S. Jacobs* *Hon. Frederick D. Nichols* *Hon. Victorine du Pont Homsey* *Hon. Kevin Roche*
Staff Present:	*Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary* *Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary* *Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson* *Mr. J. L. Sibley Jennings, Jr.* *Mrs. Sue A. Kohler* *Ms. Nancy H. Noyes* *Ms. Barbara Tatge*
D.C. Municipal Planning Office Staff Present:	*Alberto Bastida*

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. The dates for the next meetings were set at 26 September and 24 October, 1978.

B. Minutes of the July 1978 meeting were unanimously approved.

C. D.C. Bill 2-367, "Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act of 1978." The assistant Secretary reported that the Commission had made a statement before the City Council objecting to the duplicate design review aspects of the proposed city-wide preservation bill within the Georgetown and Shipstead areas. Councilperson Nadine Winter had proposed that the Chairman be included in a special task force charged with modifying the draft on a line-by-line basis. The Chairman had responded with a letter containing a number of suggestions made by the Commission during earlier discussions. The Members concurred that the Chairman and the Staff ought to follow the matter closely and cooperate with the effort. No action was required.
EXHIBIT A

D. Building height variance request, 1401 North Oak Street, Arlington, Virginia - report of action of Arlington County Board. The Secretary indicated that there had been a number of requests within the area near Arlington Cemetary and the Marine Corps Memorial for an extraordinary height of twenty nine stories. Such construction potentially would affect the western vistas from the Mall and ought to be monitored. The Commission had encouraged the Secretary to pursue the matter during its July meeting, they did so again.

E. Muhlenberg Memorial Sculpture, Confirmation Photographs/Inspection. The Secretary showed the Members photographs of the plaster study for the memorial indicating that the likeness was good. The Chairman reminded the Commission that the Memorial was to be located within a small triangular park along upper Connecticut Avenue. The Members examined the photographs and had no objection to the project. It was suggested that the Secretary might inspect the model for confirmation. EXHIBIT B

F. Board of Architectural Consultants for the Old Georgetown Act - interim appointment. The Secretary indicated that Anne Vytlacil, a member of the board, was going to assume a faculty position for the remainder of the year at San Luis Obispo, California. The Secretary recommended David Condon, FAIA, a partner of the local architectural firm, Keyes, Condon and Florance. The Commission feeling this an excellent suggestion unanimously approved Mr. Condon on an interim basis.

G. Commission of Fine Arts personnel announcements. The Secretary introduced Barbara Tatge a new clerical member of the staff. He also told the Commission of the resignation, as of August 25 of Nancy Noyes who had been with the Commission for six years. He said that Nancy had started as a student and worked up to administrative assistant; he was joined by the Commission in an expression of appreciation. Miss Noyes was then presented with a gift shirt with the words, "Make no Little Plans" printed below a reproduction of the Zorn portrait of Daniel Burnham. Miss Noyes thanked the Commission and Staff, indicating that she was sad to depart.

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

A. General Service Administration

University of the District of Columbia, Mount Vernon Campus - Master Plan. The Assistant Secretary presented drawings and a model of the revised and smaller-scaled campus design for the new D.C. facility. He indicated that the site was the same as previously reviewed by the Commission, directly on the Eighth Street axis running from the Hirshhorn Gallery to the Shaw urban renewal area. The scheme incorporated the restored and adaptively reused old D.C. Central Library at Mount Vernon Square.

Mr. Marvin Shenkler of the General Services Administration indicated that the campus was to be built over the next three to five years and that funds had been authorized to construct it at one time. He further indicated that the Commission would be asked to review specific building designs as they were prepared. Mr. Shenkler then introduced Mr. Norman Hoover, of CRS Architects-Houston, who presented the design. He showed on the model that the design was basically symmetrical in relation to its four block site about Eighth Street and L Street. Open space about the north-south axis related to the Library Building Vista from the campus and the main pedestrian link of all proposed facilities.

Mr. Roche asked how the individual buildings would be designed in terms of keeping with the geometric strength of the master plan. Mr. Hoover responded that the master planners would be a part of the overall design team for the structures themselves and that the general character of the massing may vary within each structure as designed. Mr. Shankler said that there would be strong overall coordination within the design team and that the Commission of Fine Arts would play a role in it. The Members examined the design drawings and model and gave their unanimous approval to the plan. EXHIBIT C

B. Smithsonian Institution - National Zoo

1. Central Area Development. The Secretary told the Members that working drawings had been submitted for the central area scheme previously approved by the Commission. This included the landscaping, walks and exhibit areas in and around the new ape house, renovated small mammal building and renovated reptile house. The Commission had asked that these details be submitted for confirmation as ready; the Secretary indicated that the Staff had confirmed this and the Commission unanimously approved the project.

2. Gibbon Island. The Secretary presented drawings and a model for a new exhibit designed as a pool with islands located between the end of Olmsted Walk and the old Harvard Street Bridge. The project would be the visual terminus of Olmsted Walk and would place this active and popular exibit in a visible location near one of the Zoo entrances. Dr. Theodore Reed, the Zoo Director, told the members that the Gibbon Island had been designed by Mr. Ron Taylor and served a unique function within the Zoo complex. The Members asked a number of questions about the type of facilities for climbing and the size of trees planned. Prof. Nichols asked if the little island areas within the exhibit could be more natural. Using some of the local rock was suggested by the Chairman. All agreed to unanimously approve the design with the recommendation that the small island areas be given a natural look and not treated like square lawn areas. EXHIBIT D

C. Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Fuel Oil Storage Tanks, Building 73, Anacostia Naval Station. The Assistant Secretary presented drawings for fifteen foot high industrial storage tanks to be located in an industrial area of this post across the Anacostia River from Buzzard Point. There would be a low berm and a tree preimeter to screen the tanks. Adjacent buildings would also screen the tanks to some extent.

Mr. Richard Scalessa represented the Navy and said that the tanks would minimize their visibility. The Members asked if the tanks could be burried underground. Mr. Scalessa said that the high water level in the area made that impossible. Mr. Roche in examining the maps felt that the size of the tanks was small enough that they would not be all that visible from across the river or from nearby freeways. The Commission unanimously approved the project, EXHIBIT E

D. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

Susan B. Anthony Dollar, Obverse Design. The Secretary presented a model and photographs of the proposed smaller dollar coin. He indicated that it would be between the half dollar and quarter coins in size. Period photographs of Miss Anthony were examined by the Members who found the likeness in model form much prettified and lacking in the character shown in photo form. Messers Francis Frere, Alan Gorman and Raymond Myers from the Mint were present and indicated that the design would be restudied with those comments. They showed the Members designs for the reverse of the coin which included one with an eagle in flight and one with a sitting eagle. The Commission unanimously approved the eagle in flight and recommended restudy of the Anthony portrait. EXHIBIT F

E. D.C. Department of Licenses, Inspection and Investigations

1. OG 78-127, 1218 31st Street, N.W., Office Addition - resubmission The Assistant Secretary presented a model and drawings of a revised design for the addition to an existing building. He indicated that the Georgetown Board had been very pleased by the efforts to restore the existing building which faced 31st Street in a row of buildings which were being proposed for restoration as part of the Hamilton Arms project to be discussed later on in the agenda, (OG 78-140). The Commission had previously recommended against a tower element protruding above the old building which contained a stairway to a roof terrace. A restudy had resulted in a scheme with a smaller tower element, now in glass. The Georgetown Board had reviewed the project and recommended approval with the elimination of the glass element and the use of casement sash on the alley facade of the building. Ms. Anne Vytlacil and Mr. Thomas Wright of the Board were present and indicated a hope that an open type of stair could be used to minimize the height of the project. The Assistant Secretary said that the Board had height problems with the adjacent Hamilton Arms project as well, about which the Commission would hear later in the meeting.

The owner, Mr. Phillip Grace, indicated that he had hoped the redesign would comply with the Commission's previous actions. Several citizens spoke in opposition to the size and particularly the tower element. The Commission examined the submitted material and unanimously recommended against the design.

2. OG 78-128, 3230 Reservoir Rd., N.W., Additions and Alterations. The Assistant Secretary presented drawings, photographs and a model of the proposed renovation and addition to this mid-20th Century house. A proposed front foyer and a remodelling of the garage with a rooftop study area involved limited change to the geometry of the house. The Commission examined the materials and unanimously approved the design.

3. OG 78-129, 1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W., New Office/ Apartment/Garage Building - resubmission. The Assistant Secretary presented a model and drawings showing the third reduction in height to a proposed mixed-use project for the Georgetown Waterfront. He

told of the Commission of Fine Arts twice before taking an action recommending an overall height of sixty feet for the project with a visual cornice height of 40 to 50 feet similar to the Foundry Building across Thomas Jefferson Street. The new submission reflected a number of efforts in this direction. Mr. Wright reported that the Board had felt the project was still much too large.

Mr. Koubek, the architect, said that he had attempted to comply with the Commission's previous suggestions and that the material represented mass studies and not the final facade or articulation. He indicated that the detailed design was yet to be developed once the Commission agreed to an overall size. The Chairman said that the Commission was on record recommending that no new construction over 60 feet in height be allowed in the Georgetown area. Mr. Koubek indicated that his project was for the most part in compliance with this ideal.

Several Community representatives stated their opposition to the project based on its overwhelming size and design. The Commission examined the material, in particular studying the sight lines on the model from the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Park. The Members indicated that this would be one of the most important vantage points. Though the Members felt unanimously that the project was not able to receive their approval, they were willing to encourage further study. The Chairman stated the Commission's recommendation that the architect study sightlines and sections to indicate that the project would have virtually no visibility from the Canal at Thomas Jefferson Street. He also recommended that the artchitect work with the Georgetown Board to come up with a compatible facade design.

4. OG 78-134, 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Demolition. The Assistant Secretary presented photographs of the Cherry Hill apartment building stating that the Commission had approved a preliminary design for the site, assuming the building's demolition. Mr. Buchen asked to see the approved preliminary drawings, which were shown. The Chairman said that the Commission had complimented Arthur Moore, the architect on the design. Prof. Nichols said that the Commission had encouraged the demolition of the building rather than see it added to in every direction. The Board indicated their approval for the eventual demolition.

The Assistant Secretary said that Mr. Robert Lyle, a historian and neighbor to the structure, had found the building to be considerably older than represented in earlier Commission deliberations. As stated earlier by the architect the building had been dated at 1956. Mr. Lyle indicated that research had the building built before 1917. As an early 20th Century building, he felt that the Commission should reconsider. There were a number of community comments to opposition to removal of the building on the basis of increased density of the replacement.

The Members examined the photographs of the building as existing and Mr. Lyle's photographs of the building in its original form, prior to a mid 1950's remodelling. They concurred with the Board that the building was of little architectural or historic value, but felt that approval

of its demolition ought not be given prior to approval of the actual design for the replacement.

5. OG 78-140, 1220-36 31st Street, N.W., Hamilton Arms - rebuild six buildings, demolish two buildings and shed, build two new buildings. The Assistant Secretary presented photographs, drawings and a model showing existing conditions and three alternate proposals. He reviewed the Commission's previous action on the proposed project when there had been a general concurrence to some clearance within the area but a determination that no approvals would be given to anything other than a single specific plan. The Commission had also recommended that all the buildings on 31st Street be preserved and that the buildings along the alley be retained if possible. Though there had been no action to the effect, the Commission did not register objection to the demolition to the center house, known as the Reed House, nor a small kiln-shed.

Three options were presented showing the Reed House and shed replaced by a row-type apartment building. One particularly deteriorated structure along the alley, just south of the rear drive, was recommended for demolition in all three plans, the other two recommended three buildings be removed from the alley group. One of these had new construction with a standard rear yard as required by code, the other had new row-type apartments flanking the alley. All schemes included an underground parking area beneath a center plaza.

Mr. Richard Stauffer, the architect/developer made a presentation of his scheme indicating that he wanted direction from the Commission so that he could make more detailed plans for all or part of the project. Though the buildings along 31st Street were generally proposed for restoration, Mr. Roche detected and questioned the changing of the rooflines of several of the buildings. Ms. Vytlacil reported to the Board in favor of maximum preservation on the site. The Board had no particular objection to raising the Reed house, the shed or the small building just south of the alley drive. The Assistant Secretary reported that Staff research had uncovered no compelling historical qualities for these three structures.

A number of Community representatives objected to the project in terms of its height and impact on the existing character of Hamilton Arms. There was also some favor shown to the idea of repairing and renovating a number of the buildings along 31st Street. Residents of the apartments were present with a consultant architect who indicated their desire to buy the project from Mr. Stauffer and stabilize with very little change.

The Assistant Secretary requested that the Commission specifically address the demolition question and the general design character being proposed. That is, should there be an in-fill project with underground parking, necessitating some demolition, or should the complex be retained in total. The Chairman stated that the Commission was prepared to approve nothing at the moment, because the proper procedure should be to have a specific recommended scheme approved prior to any demolition. He backed the Georgetown Board's preliminary finding in favor of maximum preservation.

Mr. Roche dissented from the rest of the Members concurrence with this. He stated that he was against the character of the proposal because it was too far from the character of the existing or original situation of the buildings. The Commission's action recommended against issuance of a building permit until more specific plans reducing the height of the center portion of the project and preserving more of the alley structures could be studied.

6. Appendix 1, approved.

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. SL 78-62, 2527 Waterside Drive, N.W., Attic Renovation and Addition of Dormer - resubmission. The Assistant Secretary reminded the Commission that they had recommended against a previous scheme for the putting an all-glass roof outside the line of adjacent buildings. The Commission had recommended that the "Colonial" character of the mid-20th Century house would be better served by traditional dormers. The Assistant Secretary showed the Commission a proposal for an over sized arched dormer. The Commission unanimously disapproved the design recommending their previous action.

2. SL 78-75, 600 Water Street, S.W., Control Tower. The Assistant Secretary presented the working drawings for a previously approved tower structure for an office/restaurant complex being built on a pier in the Washington Channel. He indicated that the drawings conformed to previous approvals as to design and material. The Commission unanimously approved the project.

3. SL 78-79, 303 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., Facade Renovations. The Assistant Secretary presented photographs of the existing conditions and drawings of the proposed alteration of a three floor 19th Century commercial building a block southeast of the Library of Congress. Mid-1950's show windows were being replaced by one large and one small arch leading into a bank. The existing show windows were neither original nor architecturally contributing to the streetscape. The Commission unanimously approved the project.

4. Appendix 2, approved.

F. D.C. Department of Transportation

Mooring of the U.S.S. Williamsburg in the Georgetown Waterfront. The Secretary told the Commission that there was a request from the D.C. Department of Transportation to comment on the mooring of this ship in Georgetown for use as a restaurant. The proposal was made by Mr. Willem Polak, President of Potomac Boat Tours, whose tour boats docked in the vicinity. Mr. Polak indicated his interest in landscaping the area and his hopes that the shore would become a National Park. His company would construct a pier and breakwater as part of the project and have the breakwater open for public use.

22 August, 1978

Several community representatives voiced concern over the project as contribution to over-crowding and congestion in the waterfront area. Mr. Polak indicated that he had made a number of presentations as to his intentions before the Georgetown Waterfront Task Force and the ANC and had hoped to eliminate any objections to this project.

The Chairman indicated that the Commission was concerned over the use of the waterfront for parking and utility storage and the Commission's continued interest in seeing this area become a park. He stated that maritime preservation was becoming increasingly important and that a waterfront area was indeed a reasonable place for preserving a boat which had some historic importance, as did the Williamsburg, the Presidential yacht in the Truman administration, and site of meetings with Churchill and Stalin. It was pointed out that the boat, being located in the water, was technically not within the Old Georgetown Act Area, but that the landscaping and quality of the accessory areas to the operation would be. Careful design of these elements ought to be part of the overall coordination of the waterfront. The Commission unanimously recommended that the city consider allowing the boat to be placed on Georgetown's waterfront. EXHIBIT G

The meeting was adjourned by the Chairman at 1:15 PM.

Signed

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton, Secretary

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT OF J. CARTER BROWN, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS, BEFORE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT July 27, 1978

My name is Carter Brown and I am Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts. We are glad to have the opportunity to testify on the "Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act of 1978" that is currently pending before the District of Columbia Council. As an agency that has had long experience with design review and landmark preservation within the District of Columbia, and as one of the agencies that would be directly involved in the implementation of this legislation, I believe we are uniquely qualified to advise the Council on the proposal before you today.

I had hoped to be able to report that the Commission gives its unqualified support to the proposed legislation. Indeed we are in favor of new measures which will strengthen the preservation of landmarks in the District of Columbia. However, the Commission has studied the legislation in considerable detail and we believe there are portions of the bill that raise substantial questions deserving much more thorough study than has been possible to date, and prevent us from supporting the bill as presently written. Let me mention just a few.

Our principal concern is the sweeping review of new construction that will be required in all historic districts. In our view there are implications here that go well beyond the primary intent of the

...2/

legislation which is to preserve the architectural integrity of historic districts. I believe there is at least some likelihood the entire District of Columbia may at some point soon be considered an historic district - an idea that may very well have merit, but an idea that also bears the need for additional scrutiny. To place in motion an architectural review process for a large portion if not all private citywide construction in the context of the preservation vantage point may very well complicate the process of development that has just begun to be felt throughout Washington. While it may be wise to take a closer look at what is happening architecturally to our neighborhoods - and we believe it would - we question whether a review structure focusing primarily on the preservation issues is the proper mechanism to control architecture on a city-wide scale. Any restrictive design review measures that could be applied across the entire District of Columbia might very well tend to inhibit worthwhile and much needed development.

Also in regard to the review of new construction, the Commission strongly believes the burden of proof should rest with the municipal government when it comes to establishing and evaluating proposals with respect to the test of public interest. We believe it is unreasonable to require an applicant, in the event of some disagreement involving design, to prove that a proposal is in fact in the public interest. Much more desirable, in our view, would be for the District Government to establish whether or not a project is contrary to the

...3/

public interest. There is a considerable difference here, and the Commission believes that only the latter approach is workable.

In the same vein of reasonable restraint and fairness to applicants for both new construction and alterations, we are convinced from our own experience that it is unwise to require a duplicate architectural review of proposals where an established mechanism exists. I speak specifically of the Georgetown and Shipstead-Luce areas where the Commission has long had the authority to advise the Mayor and the State Historic Preservation Officer on all applications for alterations and new construction in these special districts. The proposed law as it presently reads would require all architectural plans to be reviewed by both the Commission of Fine Arts and the Joint Committee on Landmarks, a process which we believe is time consuming, unnecessary, and holds considerable potential for protracted disagreement on matters of design, which I might say by nature is a matter that lends itself to differing points of view. In the event of disagreement between reviewing agencies, the applicant, of course, is left in the middle. This could involve considerable personal inconvenience and delay in projects big and small in both the Georgetown and Shipstead areas. However, in the Shipstead area in particular, which includes the historic redevelopment area of Pennsylvania Avenue, a duplication of review with its potential for ensuing delay could very well lead to a major disruption of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corpora-

...4/

tion's programs and jeopardize the remarkable progress that is beginning to take shape in renewing this great Avenue. This would be quite obviously a severe detriment to both the municipal and national interests of the city. We strongly urge that the proposed legislation before you today be amended to provide that architectural review of alterations and new construction in both the Georgetown and Shipstead districts be limited to the Commission of Fine Arts as provided by existing law.

There are other areas of the proposed law that we also feel deserve further attention and study, such as provisions for the review of land subdivisions and demolition requests. Certainly the Commission supports the tightening up of demolition regulations, since the present laws have loopholes that make this the weakest part of the city's preservation efforts. Whether or not the test of "undue economic hardship" will be the most effective way to accomplish this remains to be seen, and further modifications of the wording may very well strengthen the provisions that are currently set forth in the proposed law. The Commission of Fine Arts feels also that its review of subdivision requests in the Georgetown area in particular has been a very useful tool in controlling the development of open space, an important element in the preservation of any historic district, and we would again urge that the Commission's role in this process be left intact as provided by the current District of Columbia regulations.

...5/

In light of the questions that have been raised by the Commission, and which I know are shared by some of the witnesses that are participating in this testimony today, it is our hope that further action on this measure be delayed until such time that all interested parties have had an opportunity to further study the issues so that the best possible legislation can be enacted. Those of us who have a deep commitment to the preservation of historic areas and buildings of this city will join, I am sure, in any steps we can take to strengthen the legislative machinery needed for Washington's landmark preservation programs. We have a legal and civic obligation to do so. Any measures short of that goal will only serve to weaken it.

This concludes the Commission's testimony. Thank you.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN — FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY — KEVIN ROCHE
ELI S. JACOBS — EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

August 15, 1978

Dear Mrs. Winter:

The Commission of Fine Arts appreciated the opportunity to respond to your August 3, 1978 letter on the "Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act of 1978". Because of your request for a line-by-line commentary on the draft bill, and the extraordinarily tight time schedule, we are enclosing a list of recommendations while continuing to offer support for any larger scale or potentially more thorough re-airing of the issues.

As you will see, we recommend additional community representation and professional input. We also recommend elimination of overlapping and duplicated reviews of alteration and new construction in the Old Georgetown Act and Shipstead-Luce Act areas. Still another area is listing or registration, and we feel that buildings or areas involved in this legislation ought to be actually listed on the D.C. list or the National Register on the pure basis of defensibility. Since a high level of experience and expertise is likely to continue on the part of the joint Committee and its Staff, we are suggesting that the "burden of proof" technique reflected in the initial draft be reexamined as possibly excessively demanding on small entrepreneurs and homeowners throughout the city.

We will be delighted to work with you as the process evolves, and hope that it can result in excellent protection for our Capital.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Chairperson Nadine Winter
Committee on Housing and Urban Development
District of Columbia Council
District Building
14th & E Sts. NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS COMMENTS ON DRAFT BILL 2-367, "THE HISTORIC LANDMARK AND HISTORIC DISTRICT PROTECTION ACT OF 1978".
15 August 1978

LINE	*RECOMMENDATIONS*
44-50	*Delete everything after "National Register of Historic Places".* *(NOTE: This is the most precise and defensible technique for dealing with privately owned property.)*
51	*After word "building(s)", add "object(s) or feature(s)".* *(NOTE: This is more consistent with National Register recommendations.)*
53-54	*Delete "as of effective date of this act."* *(NOTE: This implies list inflexibility and cutoff dates which seem to have no advantage.)*
55-57	*Delete "or for which applications for such listing have been filed with the Joint Committee."* *(NOTE: To be consistent with above.)*
62	*Add: "Joint Committee Composition shall include advisory boards as needed to assist administration of the historic districts on matters described herein. Each board shall be composed of three well-qualified architects who through residence, principal practice, expertise, or office location will have experience in one or more of the historic districts. Board membership term and appointments processes to be formulated by Joint Committee on Landmarks in conjunction with District of Columbia Government."* *(NOTE: Intent is to parallel system established by Old Georgetown Act (D.C. Code 5-801) of having representative and professionally qualified advisors. Such boards may advise on one or more historic districts, and should be qualified in the field of design review.)*
103	*Delete "and"; use "or".* *(NOTE: The Commission of Fine Arts' principal concern in this legislation is avoiding duplication of design review.)*
111	*Delete "or undue economic hardship". Delete "owner"; add "District Government." Add: "The owner may submit evidence of economic hardship."* *(NOTE: Adapting some of the existing "Delay in Demolition" language with respect to contrary or not contrary may be desirable.)*

LINE	RECOMMENDATIONS
170	Add: "or" after "jurisdiction".
184	Delete: "or undue economic hardship". Delete "owner"; add "District Government". Add: "The owner may submit evidence of undue economic hardship."
209	Add: "or pursuant to the Old Georgetown Act (D.C. Code Sec. 5-801), or pursuant to the Shipstead-Luce Act (40 U.S.C. 121), of the Commission of Fine Arts."
216	Delete "or undue economic hardship". Delete "owner"; add "District Government." Add: "The owner may submit evidence of economic hardship."
240	Delete "and"; add "or".

EXHIBIT B

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BOUCHER · FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
WILLIAM PENN MOTT, JR. · ALAN POGUE
TED S. JACOBS · EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202 566-1066

23 August, 1978

Dear Mr. Fellinger:

The Commission of Fine Arts examined photographs of the full-sized plaster cast of Peter Muhlenberg prepared by Mrs. Hufford, during their August 22, 1978 meeting.

The Commission felt that the likeness as portrayed by the photographs could be approved. Nevertheless, the Commission has instructed Mr. Atherton to have a look at the actual model in the studio and to report back to the Commission prior to final approval.

Please let us know when an inspection can be arranged.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Everett G. Fellinger
President
Peter Muhlenberg Memorial
Association, Inc.
3205 38th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

EXHIBIT C

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

23 August, 1978

Dear Mr. Shenkler:

The Commission of Fine Arts wholeheartedly approves the Master Plan update for the University of the District of Columbia, Mount Vernon Campus. As expressed to you and the designers during our August 22, 1978 meeting, the Commission hopes that the full campus can be built at one time and that the design details can complement the fresh, symmetrical approach represented by the Master Plan composition.

The Commission looks forward to working with the District of Columbia and the General Services Administration throughout the design development of this project. We feel this should include not only the designs of the individual structures but the landscaping, material samples, and details as you may see fit to complement the joint efforts on behalf of this important project.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Marvin I. Shenkler
Acting Project Manager,
University of the District of Columbia
General Services Administration
Public Buildings Service
Washington, D.C. 20405

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

23 August, 1978

Dear Dr. Reed:

The Commission of Fine Arts is happy to approve designs for the Gibbon Island at the National Zoo. It terminates the vista of the central Olmsted Walk very nicely and complements beautifully Olmsted's original plan. As you recall, we also recommended that some thought be given to the shapes of the actual island areas and that these shapes result from rock outcroppings rather than overly geometric grass areas exclusively.

The Commission is also encouraged to see the detail to which the Zoo and its consultants have gone in the proposals for the Central Area. At the time that the Commission reviewed preliminary plans for this area and designs for the Ape House, our concern was that full detail landscape planning as well as careful detailing of the exterior finishes, surfaces, and additions to the existing structures be carefully thought out and supervised. We are very pleased to see this intent expressed by the detail in the working drawings and your implementation of a program providing for overall landscape coordination and consultation.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Dr. Theodore Reed
Director
National Zoological Park
Washington, D.C. 20009

EXHIBIT E

23 August, 1978

Dear Commander Beuby:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for the location of two fuel oil storage tanks adjacent to Building 73, Anacostia Naval Station, during its meeting on August 22, 1978.

The Commission approved the site design on the proviso that the tanks be painted a light or silvery grey and that they be landscaped to screen them at the time of the initial construction.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Commander H. C. Beuby
Head, Planning Department
Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Building 57, Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20374

JCB/DBM:nn

EXHIBIT F

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN — FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY — KEVIN ROCHE
ELI S. JACOBS — EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

23 August, 1978

Dear Director Hackel:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for the new smaller dollar coin during its meeting on August 22, 1978. The Commission approved the overall concept, and is especially in favor of using the eagle in flight for the reverse side of the coin. The only comment we have on the Susan B. Anthony side of the coin is a recommendation that the likeness be more exact. Our hope is that the design can be refined to include more of the distinct facial characteristics of Ms. Anthony.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Hon. Stella B. Hackel
Director of the Mint
Department of the Treasury
Washington, D.C. 20220

EXHIBIT G

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN — FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY — KEVIN ROCHE
ELI S. JACOBS — EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

23 August, 1978

Dear Mr. Schneider:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its August 22, 1978 meeting, considered the proposed mooring of the U.S.S. Williamsburg on the Georgetown waterfront. We are enclosing a portion of the transcript of this meeting for your reference. As you will see, the Commission had no specific objection to the preservation and installation as proposed in this location. However, the Commission does feel strongly that the adjacent area on the shore should be park and not parking lot.

Since you are well aware of the Commission's view as to the potential continuation of the present eyesore conditions on the Georgetown waterfront, we need not belabor the point. Since Mr. Willem Polak during our Commission meeting indicated his hope that the adjacent area would become park and his confidence that the parking within the Dodge Center could serve his operation, we would certainly have no specific objection to his endeavor, though it may be technically outside of the Historic Georgetown Public Law 808 area.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Douglas N. Schneider
Director
D.C. Department of Transportation
415 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004